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Introduction

Empirical focus

- Dutch and Afrikaans periphrastic progressives with a motion/posture verb as aspectual marker

(1) Ik loop/zit/sta/lig te werken.
I walk/sit/stand/lie to work
‘I’m working.’ (Dutch)

(2) Ek loop/sit/staan/lê en werk.
I walk/sit/stand/lie and work
‘I’m working.’ (Afrikaans)
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‘I’m working.’
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(2) Ek loop/sit/staan/lê en werk.
I walk/sit/stand/lie and work
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  - Proposing and formalising a grammaticalisation path for these MPPs, from which the attested variation follows
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### Table 1: Periphrastic progressives in Germanic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POSTURE VERBS IN MPP</strong></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘WALK’ IN MPP</strong></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSEUDOCOORDINATION</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TO-COORDINATION</strong></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDEP. PROG. INTERPRETATION</strong></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V/X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Dutch and Afrikaans are special in their MMP periphrastic progressives from a cross-Germanic perspective

- The only two Germanic languages in which motion verb \texttt{WALK} is used in MPPs
- The only two Germanic languages in which these structures can have independent progressive interpretations
- Dutch is the only language that combines the two verbs in the MPPs with \textit{te} ‘to’ (instead of pseudocoordination, but see Frisian later this talk)

So far, a unified formal analysis of the structure of Dutch and Afrikaans MPPs has not been proposed yet
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Corpora

Dutch

- Corpus based research: *SoNaR+*
  - Two subcorpora: *SoNaR-500* (500 mil. words) & *Corpus Gesproken Nederlands* (9 mil. words)
  - Standard Dutch and Flemish
  - Printed and electronic text; spoken Dutch/Flemish
  - Various registers and genres

- Dutch periphrastic progressives with motion verb *lopen* 'walk', and the posture verbs *zitten* 'sit', *staan* 'stand' and *liggen* 'lie'
- Embedded under the temporal auxiliary *hebben* 'have', to investigate the morphological form of the progressive verb.
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Afrikaans

- Corpus based research: *Korpusportaal*
  - 85 million words
  - Standard and regional Afrikaans
  - Written and electronic text, incl. text written to be spoken (broadcast)
  - Various registers and genres

Afrikaans pseudocoordination progressives with motion verb loop ‘walk’, and the posture verbs *sit*, *staan* ‘stand’ and *lê* ‘lie’

Embedded under the temporal auxiliary *het* ‘have’, to investigate the morphological form of the progressive verb.
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- In Dutch MPPs, the motion/posture verb always has to appear in IPP-form, and can never appear as past participle

(3)  

   a. Ik heb *(gelopen)/ lopen te werken.  
       I have walk. PTCP/ walk.INF to work

   b. Ik heb *(gezeten)/ zitten te werken.  
       I have sit. PTCP/ sit.INF to work

   c. Ik heb *(gestaan)/ staan te werken.  
       I have stand. PTCP/ stand.INF to work

   d. Ik heb *(gelegen)/ liggen te werken.  
       I have lie. PTCP/ lie.INF to work

   ‘I’ve been working.’ (Dutch)
The data: morphological form of the progressive verb

- In Afrikaans MPPs, the motion/posture verb can either appear in IPP-form or as past participle

(4)  

a. *Ek het geloop/ loop en werk.*  
   I have walk.PTCP/ walk.INF to work

b. *Ek het gesit/ sit en werk.*  
   I have sit.PTCP/ sit.INF to work

c. *Ek het gestaan/ staan en werk.*  
   I have stand.PTCP/ stand.INF to work

d. *Ek het gelê/ lê en werk.*  
   I have lie.PTCP/ lie.INF to work
   ‘I’ve been working.’  
   (Afrikaans)
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- IPP/no IPP-form of the progressive verb in Dutch MPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>IPP-form</th>
<th>Past participle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Lopen</em> ‘walk’</td>
<td>94 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>94 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zitten</em> ‘sit’</td>
<td>928 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>928 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Staan</em> ‘stand’</td>
<td>123 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>123 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Liggen</em> ‘lie’</td>
<td>214 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>214 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Morphological form of the progressive verb in Dutch MPPs
The data: morphological form of the progressive verb

- IPP/no IPP-form of the progressive verb in Dutch MPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>IPP-form</th>
<th>Past participle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lopen</td>
<td>94 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>94 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zitten</td>
<td>928 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>928 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staan</td>
<td>123 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>123 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liggen</td>
<td>214 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>214 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Morphological form of the progressive verb in Dutch MPPs

- In all Dutch MPPs, the progressive verb occurs in IPP-form
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- IPP/no IPP-form of the progressive verb in Afrikaans MPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>IPP-form</th>
<th>Past participle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Loop</em> ‘walk’</td>
<td>83 (74,8%)</td>
<td>28 (25,2%)</td>
<td>109 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sit</em> ‘sit’</td>
<td>220 (48,4%)</td>
<td>235 (51,6%)</td>
<td>455 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Staan</em> ‘staan’</td>
<td>155 (44,8%)</td>
<td>191 (55,2%)</td>
<td>346 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lê</em> ‘lie’</td>
<td>113 (45,4%)</td>
<td>136 (54,6%)</td>
<td>249 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- **Focus 2:** the presence/absence of *te* ‘to’ for Dutch and *en* ‘and’ for Afrikaans

- **Motion** verb MPPs in Dutch and Afrikaans have been reported to show high frequencies of *te/en*-drop, which has been said to be less frequent/ungrammatical in the posture verb counterparts (Haeseryn et al. 1997; Biberauer 2017)
The data: presence/absence of *te/en*

(5) *Ik heb in de schaduw lopen *(te) wachten.*
I have in the shade walk to wait
‘I’ve been waiting in the shade.’

(6) *Ik heb in de schaduw staan *(te) wachten.*
I have in the shade stand to wait
‘I’ve been waiting in the shade.’ (Dutch)
The data: presence/absence of te/en

(7) Ek het in die skadu loop (en) wag.  
I have in the shade walk and wait  
‘I’ve been waiting in the shade.’

(8) Ek het in die skadu staan *(en) wag.  
I have in the shade stand and wait  
‘I’ve been waiting in the shade.’  

(Afrikaans)
The data: presence/absence of *te/en*

Presence/absence of *te* in Dutch MPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Te present</th>
<th>Te absent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lopen ‘walk’</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>94 (100%)</td>
<td>94 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zitten ‘sit’</td>
<td>8 (0,8%)</td>
<td>920 (99,2%)</td>
<td>928 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staan ‘stand’</td>
<td>13 (10,7%)</td>
<td>110 (89,4%)</td>
<td>123 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liggen ‘lie’</td>
<td>2 (0,9%)</td>
<td>212 (99,1%)</td>
<td>214 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Presence/absence of *te* in Dutch MPPs
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Lopen</em> ‘walk’</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>94 (100%)</td>
<td>94 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zitten</em> ‘sit’</td>
<td>8 (0,8%)</td>
<td>920 (99,2%)</td>
<td>928 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Staan</em> ‘stand’</td>
<td>13 (10,7%)</td>
<td>110 (89,4%)</td>
<td>123 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Liggen</em> ‘lie’</td>
<td>2 (0,9%)</td>
<td>212 (99,1%)</td>
<td>214 (100%)</td>
</tr>
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</table>

Table 4: Presence/absence of *te* in Dutch MPPs

- No occurrences of *te* in *lopen* MPPs, few instances with posture verb MPPs
The data: presence/absence of *te/en*

- Presence/absence of *en* in Afrikaans MPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th><em>En</em> present</th>
<th><em>En</em> absent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loop</strong> ‘walk’</td>
<td>24 (21.6%)</td>
<td>85 (78.4%)</td>
<td>109 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sit</strong> ‘sit’</td>
<td>455 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>455 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staan</strong> ‘staan’</td>
<td>346 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>346 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lê</strong> ‘lie’</td>
<td>249 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>249 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Presence/absence of *en* ‘and’ in Afrikaans PeriProgs
The data: presence/absence of *te/en*

- Presence/absence of *en* in Afrikaans MPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>En present</th>
<th>En absent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loop ‘walk’</td>
<td>24 (21.6%)</td>
<td>85 (78.4%)</td>
<td>109 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit ‘sit’</td>
<td>455 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>455 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staan ‘staan’</td>
<td>346 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>346 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lê ‘lie’</td>
<td>249 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>249 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Presence/absence of *en* ‘and’ in Afrikaans PeriProgs

- We only find occurrences of *en*-drop with motion verb *loop*
Summary of the data

Morphological form of the progressive verb:

In Dutch MPPs, the motion/posture verb always appears in IPP-form.

In Afrikaans MPPs, the motion verb appears in IPP-form in roughly 75% of the cases and in past participle form in 25%; for the posture verbs, IPP/past participle form occur equally frequently.

Presence/absence of te/en:

In Dutch, all motion MPPs hits show te-drop, while there are some occurrences of te in posture MPPs.

In Afrikaans, there are high occurrences of en-drop in motion MPPs, and no hits with posture MPPs.
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Summary of the data

- **Morphological form of the progressive verb:**
  - In Dutch MPPs, the *motion/posture* verb always appears in IPP-form.
  - In Afrikaans MPPs, the *motion* verb appears in IPP-form in roughly 75% of the cases and in past participle form in 25%; for the *posture* verbs, IPP/past participle form occur equally frequently.

- **Presence/absence of te/en:**
  - In Dutch, all *motion* MPPs hits show *te*-drop, while there are some occurrences of *te* in *posture* MPPs.
  - In Afrikaans, there are high occurrences of *en*-drop in *motion* MPPs, and no hits with *posture* MMPs.
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The morphological status of ge-

Dutch ge- is a regular verbal affix

- It is in complementary distribution with other verbal prefixes

ge-daan, ver-teld, *ge-ver-teld, *ver-ge-teld
The morphological status of *ge-

Dutch *ge- is a regular verbal affix

- The sequence *ge-V cannot be interrupted by a particle

  af-*ge*-haald, *ge*-af-haald
The morphological status of ge-

Afrikaans ge- is a phrasal affix

- It is not in complementary distribution with other verbal prefixes; but can only appear to the left of the verbal prefix

ge-doen, ver-tel, ge-ver-tel, *ver-ge-tel

(Conradie 2012:12)
The morphological status of ge-

Afrikaans ge- is a phrasal affix

- The sequence ge-V can be interrupted by a particle

  _af-ge-haal, ge-af-haal_  

(Prinsloo 2009:78)
The morphological status of \textit{ge-}

\textit{Afrikaans ge- is a phrasal affix}

- Conradie (2012:12): \textit{Afrikaans ge- is a phrasal affix}, with much more syntactic independence than Dutch \textit{ge-}
The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs

Dutch and Afrikaans progressive verbs can still retain their lexical semantics, but their semantics seem also to be bleached (Haeseryn et al. 1997, Biberauer 2017, Breed 2017). The motion/posture verbs in MPPs do not always entail a physical motion/seated/standing/lying position in MPPs. They can sometimes even combine with a lexical verb incompatible with motion/postural position (Pots & Fraser, in prep). Semantic bleaching is an indication of a shift from being lexical to being functional (Sweetser 1988).
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Dutch and Afrikaans progressive verbs can still retain their lexical semantics, but their semantics seem also to be bleached (Haeseryn et al. 1997, Biberauer 2017, Breed 2017)

The motion/posture verbs in MPPs do not always entail a physical motion/seated/standing/lying position in MPPs

They can sometimes even combine with a lexical verb incompatible with motion/postural position (Pots & Fraser, in prep)

Semantic bleaching is an indication of a shift from being lexical to being functional (Sweetser 1988)
The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs

Example physical motion entailed

(9) Het was een kudde herten die had open grazen in het struikgewas aan de overkant. Bushes on the other side. ‘It was a herd of deer that had been grazing in the bushes on the other side.’

(Dutch, SoNaR+)
The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs

Example lexical verb incompatible with physical motion

(10) Jammer dat ze in de show hadden lopen knippen, Pity that they in the show had walk cut, miste een aantal leuke stukken. missed a couple fun parts. ‘[It is] a pity that they’ve been cutting in the show, a couple of fun parts were missing.’

(Dutch, SoNaR+)
The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs

- When a vocabulary item is semi-lexical, its functional use is often syntactically more restricted than its lexical use (De Belder 2011:102)
The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs

- When a vocabulary item is semi-lexical, its functional use is often syntactically more restricted than its lexical use (De Belder 2011:102)
- For example, Dutch *stuk* ‘piece’ can be functional and lexical, but when it is used functionally, it cannot take a diminutive suffix
Lexical use of Dutch *stuk*:

(11) a. Ik heb twee **stukken** van deze banaan gegeten.
    I have two pieces of this banana eaten
    ‘I’ve eaten two pieces of this banana.’

    b. Ik heb twee **stuk-je-s** van deze banaan gegeten.
    I have two pieces.DIM.PL of this banana eaten
    ‘I’ve eaten two small pieces of this banana.’
Functional use of Dutch *stuk*:

(12) Hoeveel bananen heb je gekocht?
    How many bananas have you bought
    ‘How many bananas did you buy?’

(13) a. Ik heb twee *stuks* gekocht.
    I have two specimens bought
    ‘I’ve bought two specimens.’

b. *Ik heb twee *stuk-je-s* gekocht.
    I have two specimens.DIM.PL bought
    Intended meaning: ‘I’ve bought two small specimens of banana.’
Similarly to restricted syntactic behaviour of functional *stuk* in Dutch, Dutch *lopen* shows restricted behaviour when used as a progressive verb rather than a lexical verb.
Similarly to restricted syntactic behaviour of functional *stuk* in Dutch, Dutch *lopen* shows restricted behaviour when used as a progressive verb rather than a lexical verb.

Lexical *lopen* can be either embedded under temporal auxiliary *hebben* ‘have’, or under temporal auxiliary *zijn* ‘be’ when a endpoint/goal of the motion is indicated.
The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs

- Similarly to restricted syntactic behaviour of functional *stuk* in Dutch, Dutch *lopen* shows restricted behaviour when used as a progressive verb rather than a lexical verb.
- Lexical *lopen* can be either embedded under temporal auxiliary *hebben* ‘have’, or under temporal auxiliary *zijn* ‘be’ when a endpoint/goal of the motion is indicated.
- Progressive *lopen* can only be embedded under temporal auxiliary *hebben* ‘have’.
The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs

Lexical use of Dutch *lopen*

(14)  

a. *Ik heb dit weekend veel gelopen.*  
*I have this weekend a lot walk.PTCP*  
‘I’ve walked a lot this weekend.’

b. *Ik ben dit weekend naar mijn oude huis gelopen.*  
*I am this weekend to my old house walk.PTCP*  
‘I’ve walked to my previous house this weekend.’

"loppt"
The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs

Progressive use of Dutch *lopen*

(15)  a. *Ik heb dit weekend veel *lopen* bellen.*
    I have this weekend a.lot walk.IPP call
    ‘I’ve been calling a lot this weekend.’

    b. *Ik **ben** dit weekend veel *lopen* bellen.*
    I am this weekend a.lot walk.IPP call
    Intended meaning: ‘I’ve been calling a lot this weekend.’
The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs

- Taken together, the semantic bleaching and the restricted syntactic behaviour of these items show that Dutch and Afrikaans motion and posture verbs are used functionally when they appear in MPPs.
The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs

- Taken together, the semantic bleaching and the restricted syntactic behaviour of these items show that Dutch and Afrikaans motion and posture verbs are used functionally when they appear in MPPs.
- They can still retain their lexical semantics, making Dutch and Afrikaans motion and posture verbs semi-lexical.
What it means to be semi-lexical

- I follow Klockmann (2017)’s approach to semi-lexicality, in which a semi-lexical item is defined as a root that is lexically specified for a syntactic feature.
What it means to be semi-lexical

Defining semi-lexicality (Klockmann 2017)
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What it means to be semi-lexical

Defining semi-lexicality (Klockmann 2017)

- Being lexical implies the presence of a **root**
- Being functional implies the presence of a **syntactic feature**
- Semi-lexicality is often cited as the combination of lexical and functional properties in a single lexical item
- **Semi-lexicality is what occurs when a root is specified for a syntactic feature**
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Grammaticalisation path for MPPs

- Dutch and Afrikaans *motion* and *posture* verbs are semi-lexical
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- Dutch and Afrikaans motion and posture verbs are semi-lexical
- I.e. they are roots that are specified for a syntactic feature
Grammaticalisation path for MPPs

- Dutch and Afrikaans motion and posture verbs are semi-lexical
- I.e. they are roots that are specified for a syntactic feature
- Since they indicate progressive aspect of the lexical verb in MPPs, I propose this feature is a [Prog] feature
Grammaticalisation path for MPPs

- The reanalysis of the motion/posture verbs is caused by the frequent coordination of these verbs with another verb, leading to bleaching of the semantics of these verbs (cf. Jespersen’s Cycle-type developments, Biberauer p.c.)
Grammaticalisation path for MPPs

▶ The reanalysis of the motion/posture verbs is caused by the frequent coordination of these verbs with another verb, leading to bleaching of the semantics of these verbs (cf. Jespersen’s Cycle-type developments, Biberauer p.c.)

▶ The semantic bleaching goes from the motion/posture verbs’ lexical meaning to a more schematic, abstract meaning of iteration/duration, eventually leading to a progressive interpretation (cf. Sweetser 1988, Kuteva 1999)
Grammaticalisation path for MPPs

- When a lexical item develops a functional use, it is becoming more grammaticalised.

  The first step in obtaining this (uninterpretable) syntactic feature is the very frequent occurrence of the element in a functional context (i.e. embedding a lexical verb), which creates a functional flavour (Klockmann 2017). This eventually leads to the language acquirer to postulate such a feature on that exact element (in our case, on the motion/posture verbs).
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- When a lexical item develops a functional use, it is becoming more grammaticalised.

- *My proposal:* grammaticalisation from a lexical item to a functional item can mean acquiring an uninterpretable syntactic feature, which becomes interpretable when the item is further along the grammaticalisation path.

- The first step in obtaining this (uninterpretable) syntactic feature is the very frequent occurrence of the element in a functional context (i.e., embedding a lexical verb), which creates a functional flavour (Klockmann 2017).

- This eventually leads to the language acquirer to postulate such a feature on that exact element (in our case, on the *motion/posture* verbs).
Grammaticalisation path for MPPs

Proposed possible grammaticalisation path:

\[
\text{root} \rightarrow \text{root} + [uF] \rightarrow [iF]
\]

For Dutch/Afrikaans motion/posture verbs:

\[
\text{root} \rightarrow \text{root} + [u\text{Prog}] \rightarrow [i\text{Prog}]
\]
Grammaticalisation path for MPPs

- The motion and posture verbs in Dutch and Afrikaans are semantically bleached to different extents (Biberauer 2017, Breed 2017, Lemmens 2005, Pots & Fraser to appear)
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- In both languages, the motion verbs are semantically bleached to the highest extent, followed by the Dutch posture verbs; the Afrikaans ones being hardly bleached at all.
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- The motion and posture verbs in Dutch and Afrikaans are semantically bleached to different extents (Biberauer 2017, Breed 2017, Lemmens 2005, Pots & Fraser to appear)
- In both languages, the motion verbs are semantically bleached to the highest extent, followed by the Dutch posture verbs; the Afrikaans ones being hardly bleached at all
- I.e. the motion verbs are further along on the grammaticalisation path compared to the posture verbs, of which the Afrikaans ones are the least far along this path
Grammaticalisation path for MPPs

- My proposal: there are two different structures for MPPs, with the grammaticalisation path of the progressive verbs going from the structure in (16) to the structure in (17)

(16)

... → ProgP
      /  
     /   
  Prog [iProg]  √V1
     / 
    /   
 [uProg] F'  F

(17)

... → ProgP
      /  
     /   
  Prog [iProg]  √V2
Grammaticalisation path for MPPs

- In the first structure, the motion/posture verb is a root specified for a [uProg] feature: its semantics are still salient.
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- We thus have to merge the motion/posture root with the root of the lexical verb
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- In the first structure, the **motion/posture** verb is a root specified for a [\(u\)Prog] feature: its semantics are still salient
- We thus have to merge the **motion/posture** root with the root of the lexical verb
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- In the first structure, the motion/posture verb is a root specified for a [uProg] feature: its semantics are still salient
- We thus have to merge the motion/posture root with the root of the lexical verb
- This intervening functional head does not add any meaning that is not already added by merge; it is conjunctive (De Belder 2011: 248)
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- In the first structure, the motion/posture verb is a root specified for a \([u\text{Prog}]\) feature: its semantics are still salient.
- We thus have to merge the motion/posture root with the root of the lexical verb.
- This intervening functional head does not add any meaning that is not already added by merge; it is conjunctive (De Belder 2011: 248).
- In Afrikaans, this position is filled by \(en\), in Dutch by \(te\), which semantics are close to vacuous (Broekhuis & Corver 2015).
Afrikaans MPPs

The two structures for Afrikaans MPPs:

\[ \text{ProgP} \]

... 

\[ \text{F} \]

... 

\[ \text{P} \]

... 

\[ \text{V} \]


Root insertion of the motion/posture verb brings about its lexical semantics.

Recall: Afrikaans ge- is a phrasal verbal affix.

Assumption: ge- can only attach to lexical material.

In the first structure, it can attach to the combined roots complex, in the second structure it cannot attach.
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The two structures for Afrikaans MPPs:

(18)...

(19)...

▶ The root insertion of the motion/posture verb brings about its lexical semantics
▶ Recall: Afrikaans ge- is a phrasal verbal affix
Afrikaans MPPs

The two structures for Afrikaans MPPs:

(18)

(19)

The root insertion of the motion/posture verb brings about its lexical semantics

Recall: Afrikaans ge- is a phrasal verbal affix

Assumption: ge- can only attach to lexical material
Afrikaans MPPs

The two structures for Afrikaans MPPs:

(18)

$\ldots$

$\ldots$

$\text{ProgP}$

$\text{Prog}$

$[i\text{Prog}]$

$\sqrt{V_1}$

$[u\text{Prog}]$

$\text{F'}$

$\text{F}$

$\sqrt{V_2}$

$en$

(19)

$\ldots$

$\ldots$

$\text{ProgP}$

$\text{Prog}$

$[i\text{Prog}]$

$\sqrt{V_2}$

$\text{F}$

$\sqrt{V_2}$

$en$

- The root insertion of the motion/posture verb brings about its lexical semantics
- Recall: Afrikaans ge- is a phrasal verbal affix
- Assumption: ge- can only attach to lexical material
- In the first structure, it can attach to the combined roots complex, in the second structure it cannot attach
Afrikaans MPPs

- *Recall:* Afrikaans *loop* is much more semantically bleached than the *posture* verbs
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- Recall: Afrikaans *loop* is much more semantically bleached than the *posture* verbs
- Afrikaans *loop* is further along the grammaticalisation path from the first to the second structure compared to the *posture* verbs
Recall: Afrikaans *loop* is much more semantically bleached than the *posture* verbs

Afrikaans *loop* is further along the grammaticalisation path from the first to the second structure compared to the *posture* verbs

The fact that it shows much higher frequencies of *en*-drop and bare, IPP-form follows from it being close to only being able to have the latter structure, in which there is not F head (so no *en*), and in which *ge-* cannot attach to anything
Afrikaans MPPs

- Afrikaans *loop* has also developed an andative interpretation

(20) Stel jou voor, dat elkeen vir hom een donkie loop vang het.
Imagine you for, that everyone for himself a walk catch have
‘Imagine, that everyone would go and catch a donkey of his own.’ (Afrikaans, Korpusportaal)
Afrikaans MPPs

▶ Afrikaans *loop* has also developed an andative interpretation

(20) Stel jou voor, dat elkeen vir hom een donkie
Imagine you for, that everyone for himself a donkey
loop vang het.
walk catch have
‘Imagine, that everyone would go and catch a donkey of his own.’

(Afrikaans, Korpusportaal)

▶ *Loop* is thus grammaticalising to an even higher position in the functional sequence
Afrikaans MPPs

- Afrikaans *loop* has also developed an andative interpretation

(20) Stel jou voor, dat elkeen vir hom een donkie loop vang het.
Imagine you for, that everyone for himself a donkey loop walk catch have
‘Imagine, that everyone would go and catch a donkey of his own.’

(Afrikaans, Korpusportaal)

- *Loop* is thus grammaticalising to an even higher position in the functional sequence
- This illustrates how one element can grammaticalise in a layered fashion (cf. English ‘have’, Dutch ‘hebben’; Hopper & Traugott 1993, Roberts & Roussou 2003, Wall 2018)
In the present corpus data, andative *loop* almost always has *en*-drop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th><em>En</em> present</th>
<th><em>En</em> absent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andative</td>
<td>3 (6.8%)</td>
<td>41 (93.2%)</td>
<td>44 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>13 (48.0%)</td>
<td>12 (52.0%)</td>
<td>25 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>9 (22.5%)</td>
<td>31 (77.5%)</td>
<td>40 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Grant total* 109 (100%)

Table 6: Type of aspect combined with presence/absence of *en* in Afrikaans *loop* MPPs
Similarly, in the present corpus data, andative *loop* almost always occurs in bare, IPP-form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>IPP-form</th>
<th>Past participle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andative</td>
<td>40 (90,9%)</td>
<td>4 (9,1%)</td>
<td>44 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>13 (48,0%)</td>
<td>12 (52,0%)</td>
<td>25 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>9 (22,5%)</td>
<td>31 (77,5%)</td>
<td>40 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>109 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Type of aspect combined with morphological form of *loop* MPPs
The idea that Afrikaans andative *loop* has grammaticalised in a higher position in the functional sequence is supported by it being able to embed *posture* verbs:

(21) Sy het die maraton in rekordtyd *loop staan en* wen!
She have the marathon in record-time walk stand and win!
‘She went and won the marathon in record time!’

(Biberauer 2017: 4)
Dutch MPPs
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The root insertion of the motion/posture verb brings about its lexical semantics

Recall: Dutch ge- is a regular verbal affix, not phrasal
The two structures for Dutch MPPs:

(22) …

(23) …

▶ The root insertion of the motion/posture verb brings about its lexical semantics
▶ Recall: Dutch \textit{ge}- is a regular verbal affix, not phrasal
▶ Assumption: \textit{ge}- can only attach to lexical material
Dutch MPPs

The two structures for Dutch MPPs:

\[(22)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\cdots \\
\cdots \\
\text{ProgP} \\
\text{Prog} \\
\text{[iProg]} \\
\sqrt{V_1} \\
[u\text{Prog}] \\
F' \\
F \\
\sqrt{V_2} \\
te
\end{array}
\]

\[(23)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\cdots \\
\text{ProgP} \\
\text{Prog} \\
\text{[iProg]} \\
\sqrt{V_2}
\end{array}
\]

- The root insertion of the motion/posture verb brings about its lexical semantics
- \textit{Recall}: Dutch \textit{ge-} is a regular verbal affix, not phrasal
- \textit{Assumption}: \textit{ge-} can only attach to lexical material
- Dutch \textit{ge-} thus cannot attach to either one of the structures (cf. Zwart (2016), Dros-Hendriks (2018))
Recall: Dutch *lopen* is much more semantically bleached than the *posture* verbs, but the *posture* verbs are also more semantically bleached than the Afrikaans ones.
Recall: Dutch *lopen* is much more semantically bleached than the *posture* verbs, but the *posture* verbs are also more semantically bleached than the Afrikaans ones.

Dutch *lopen* is further along the grammaticalisation path from the first to the second structure compared to the *posture* verbs, but these latter are also quite far on this path.
Dutch MPPs

- *Recall*: Dutch *lopen* is much more semantically bleached than the *posture* verbs, but the *posture* verbs are also more semantically bleached than the Afrikaans ones.
- Dutch *lopen* is further along the grammaticalisation path from the first to the second structure compared to the *posture* verbs, but these latter are also quite far on this path.
- The fact that we see no occurrences of *te* with Dutch *lopen* follows from it being so grammaticalised that it only has the latter structure.
Dutch MPPs

- **Recall**: Dutch *lopen* is much more semantically bleached than the *posture* verbs, but the *posture* verbs are also more semantically bleached than the Afrikaans ones.

- Dutch *lopen* is further along the grammaticalisation path from the first to the second structure compared to the *posture* verbs, but these latter are also quite far on this path.

- The fact that we see no occurrences of *te* with Dutch *lopen* follows from it being so grammaticalised that it only has the latter structure.

- The low occurrences of *te* with the Dutch *posture* verbs follows from them also being highly grammaticalised, i.e. often having the second structure.
Recall: Dutch *lopen* is much more semantically bleached than the *posture* verbs, but the *posture* verbs are also more semantically bleached than the Afrikaans ones

Dutch *lopen* is further along the grammaticalisation path from the first to the second structure compared to the *posture* verbs, but these latter are also quite far on this path

The fact that we see no occurrences of *te* with Dutch *lopen* follows from it being so grammaticalised that it only has the latter structure

The low occurrences of *te* with the Dutch *posture* verbs follows from them also being highly grammaticalised, i.e. often having the second structure

Dutch *ge*- is not a phrasal affix, meaning it can never attach to any of the two structures: we find the bare, IPP-form across the board
Note that te-drop also occurs in high frequencies with other Dutch verbs that are becoming more functional/modal, i.e. *hoeven* ‘need’ and *durven* ‘dare’ (Haeseryn et al. 1997; Pots 2017; Van de Velde 2017)

(24) Dat hij niet heeft *hoeven/ durven (te) komen.*
That he not has need/ dare to come.
‘That he didn’t need/dare to come.’
Dutch MPPs

- Note that *te*-drop also occurs in high frequencies with other Dutch verbs that are becoming more functional/modal, i.e. *hoeven* ‘need’ and *durven* ‘dare’ (Haeseryn et al. 1997; Pots 2017; Van de Velde 2017)

(24) Dat hij niet heeft *hoeven/ durven* (te) komen.
That he not has need/ dare to come.
‘That he didn’t need/dare to come.’

- These verbs used to always select a *te*-complement, but now show a rapid increase of selecting bare complements, while acquiring a more modal flavour
The different degree of grammaticalisation in Dutch and Afrikaans

This study shows that Dutch MPPs are more grammaticalised than Afrikaans MPPs.

Both languages have three periphrastic progressive constructions ('busy with V', 'at the V' and the MPPs). A comparative study by Breed et al. (2017) has shown that in Dutch the MPP construction is used much more frequently than in Afrikaans.

More frequent use is beneficial for grammaticalisation, e.g., Dutch MPPs are more grammaticalised because it is a more common option compared to Afrikaans MPPs.
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- Both languages have three periphrastic progressive constructions ('busy with V', 'at the V' and the MPPs)
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- Frisian only recently developed periphrastic progressives with posture verbs (Taalportaal 2018) (very marginally with motion verb *rinne* ‘walk’ (Hoekstra 1997))

(25)  
As er dêr sa yn ’e doar **stie**  te kjeldskypjen.  
when he there so in the door stood to cold.catch  
‘When he stood there in the door, catching a cold.’
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- Frisian only recently developed periphrastic progressives with posture verbs (Taalportaal 2018) (very marginally with motion verb rinne ‘walk’ (Hoekstra 1997))

(25) As er dêr sa yn ’e doar stie te kjeldskypjen.
when he there so in the door stood to cold.catch
‘When he stood there in the door, catching a cold.’

- The lexical semantics of the posture verb is retained
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- We furthermore see that the construction is much more restricted than in Dutch.
- The posture verbs usually only select intransitive verbs of activity, i.e. lexical verbs with which it shares the same argument structure, and with it is compatible in semantics.
- A very recent development is them also sporadically occurring with transitive lexical verbs (Taalportaal 2018).
- I.e. Frisian is a perfect case study on how MPPs can become grammaticalised (*future work*).
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Note furthermore that the Frisian MPP first developed in present tense context, and only sporadically occurs embedded under a temporal auxiliary, in which case te is always present.

(26) En nei’t se in skoftke tegeare op ’e bank sitten and after they a while together on the bench sat hiene te praten. had to talk ‘And after they had sat talking on the bench a while.’

(Taalportaal 2018)
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Note furthermore that the Frisian MPP first developed in present tense context, and only sporadically occurs embedded under a temporal auxiliary, in which case *te* is always present.

(26) En nei’t se in skoftke tegeare op ’e bank *sitten*
and after they a while together on the bench sat
*hiene te praten.*
had to talk
‘And after they had sat talking on the bench a while.’

(Taalportaal 2018)

This shows that for the *posture* verb is still ‘on its way in’ into the subcategory of restructuring verbs in Frisian.
Parallels in the nominal domain

Klockmann (2017: 337): there seem to be clear parallels between semi-lexicality in the verbal domain (i.e. cases of restructuring, cf. Wurmbrand 2004, on the difference between functional and lexical restructuring) and semi-lexicality in the nominal domain.
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(27) A lot/ton/bunch of books.
(28) Many books.
(29) A hundred books.

- English quantificational nouns (Q-nouns) indicate quantity, like quantifiers and numerals
- Klockmann (2018) analyses these Q-nouns as semi-lexical roots
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(30) A ton/tons of students *was/weren’t studying.

(31) A ton of herring was standing at the shore.

- Q-nouns cannot function as agreement targets when used in this quantifying way, despite appearing to be singular nouns; they can in their lexical use
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(30) A ton/tons of students *was/weren’t studying.

(31) A ton of herring was standing at the shore.

- Q-nouns cannot function as agreement targets when used in this quantifying way, despite appearing to be singular nouns; they can in their lexical use.
- The Q-noun cannot serve as an intervener for Agreement or number sensitive processes: it lacks a number projection, this deficiency showing that it is semi-lexical.
Parallels in the nominal domain

- The presence or absence of *of* in English pseudopartitive Q-nouns indicates the level of grammaticalisation of these elements.

  - Similarly, we see that *of* is disappearing with 'a couple of X' in younger speakers of American English ('a couple X'); and 'a dozen X' used to have *of* 'a dozen of X', usually not being permitted anymore in modern-day English (Klockmann 2017: 216).
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- I.e. *of* is required for combining the Q-noun root and the root of the noun, but is absent with fully grammaticalised quantifiers and numerals (Klockmann 2018:22).
- Similarly, we see that *of* is disappearing with ‘a couple of X’ in younger speakers of American English (‘a couple X’);
- and ‘a dozen X’ used to have *of* ‘a dozen of X’, usually not being permitted anymore in modern-day English (Klockmann 2017: 216).
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▶ One parallel between in semi-lexicality in the nominal and the verbal domain is thus a semantically vacuous element intervening when the semi-lexical item is still too much ’noun-/verb-like’ (of for Q-nouns in English, te/en for progressive verbs in Dutch/Afrikaans)
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- One parallel between in semi-lexicality in the nominal and the verbal domain is thus a semantically vacuous element intervening when the semi-lexical item is still too much 'noun-/verb-like' (of for Q-nouns in English, te/en for progressive verbs in Dutch/Afrikaans)

- Another parallel is the semi-lexical items (when more grammaticalised) taking the same form as the lower, actual noun/verb
Parallels in the nominal domain

(32)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{This kind/\textit{kinds} of rabbit.} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{This kinds/\textit{kind} of rabbits.}
\end{align*}

(33)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{This family of insects.} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{This genre of films.}
\end{align*}

- Kind-words (\textit{kind}, \textit{type} and \textit{sort}) are semi-lexical (Klockmann 2017: 276-7)
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(32)  a. This kind/*kinds of rabbit.
     b. This kinds/*kind of rabbits.

(33)  a. This family of insects.
     b. This genre of films.

- Kind-words (kind, type and sort) are semi-lexical (Klockmann 2017: 276-7)
- They need to have the same number marking as the lower, lexical noun
Parallels in the nominal domain

Similarly, Dutch progressive verbs have the same morphological form as the lower, lexical verb

(34)

a. Ik heb *(gelopen)/ lopen te werken.
   I have walk.PTCP/ walk.INF to work.INF

b. Ik heb *(gezeten)/ zitten te werken.
   I have sit.PTCP/ sit.INF to work.INF

c. Ik heb *(gestaan)/ staan te werken.
   I have stand.PTCP/ stand.INF to work.INF

d. Ik heb *(gelegen)/ liggen te werken.
   I have lie.PTCP/ lie.INF to work.INF

‘I’ve been working.’ (Dutch)
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- Similarly, Dutch progressive verbs have the same morphological form as the lower, lexical verb

\[\text{(34)}\]

a. \(\text{Ik heb *(gelopen)/ lopen te werken.}\)
I have walk.\text{PTCP/ walk.}\text{INF to work.}\text{INF}

b. \(\text{Ik heb *(gezeten)/ zitten te werken.}\)
I have sit.\text{PTCP/ sit.}\text{INF to work.}\text{INF}

c. \(\text{Ik heb *(gestaan)/ staan te werken.}\)
I have stand.\text{PTCP/ stand.}\text{INF to work.}\text{INF}

d. \(\text{Ik heb *(gelegen)/ liggen te werken.}\)
I have lie.\text{PTCP/ lie.}\text{INF to work.}\text{INF}

‘I’ve been working.’
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- **New data**: Dutch and Afrikaans MPPs show:

  - different morphosyntactic behaviour (IPP/no-IPP, presence/absence of te/en)
  - different degrees of semantic bleaching of the progressive verbs
  - Analysis: Dutch and Afrikaans progressive verbs are on a grammaticalisation path
  - They are semi-lexical items in the process of becoming more functional (i.e. real progressive markers)
  - The proposed grammaticalisation path goes from being a root with a $\text{[u} \text{Prog]}$ feature to being a $\text{[i} \text{Prog]}$ feature
  - The presence/absence of te/en and ge- (for Afrikaans) are indications of where the progressive verbs are on the grammaticalisation path
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  - They are semi-lexical items in the process of becoming more functional (i.e. real progressive markers)
  - The proposed grammaticalisation path goes from being a root with a [uProg] feature to being a [iProg] feature
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The apparent optionality (*te/en*-drop and IPP/bare form of the progressive verbs) is a side effect of these motion/posture verbs being semi-lexical items and being grammaticalised to different extents.
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Conclusion and outlook

- The apparent optionality (te/en-drop and IPP/bare form of the progressive verbs) is a side effect of these motion/posture verbs being semi-lexical items and being grammaticalised to different extents.

- Very similar patterns of semi-lexicality causing apparent optionality is attested in the nominal domain (Q-nouns and kind-words in English (Klockmann 2017; also showing this for Polish numerals)).

- *Future work*: further investigating the parallels of semi-lexicality in the nominal and verbal domain.
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